•	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/849,299	KOIDE, TAMAKI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Justin Krause	3682
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>Allowed</u>	
(1) <u>Justin Krause</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Daniel Shanley</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 30 November 2007	Time: <u>2 pm</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: None		
Claims discussed: Claim 1		
Prior art documents discussed: None		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
L.al		
Thomas R. Hannon Thomas R. Graniner		
Primary Examiner		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant	/Applicant's Representative Signature	gnature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner proposed language to overcome the art of record and place the application in condition for allowance, see Examiner's Amendment. The added language overcomes the lida reference, in which, under the broadest reasonable interpretation would have anticipated the claim language "fixed to said lever side link element" (cl 1, lines 12-13), because the shift lever is captured in a ball socket and therefore fixed, but the prior art does not prevent relative movement between the shift lever and the lever side link element..